

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALOE PAL,  
Plaintiff,

v.

NORTHROP GRUMMAN  
CORPORATION et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 8:24-cv-02703-SB-ADS

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Plaintiff filed this action December 16, 2024, raising claims under federal and state law, and requested to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP). Dkt. Nos. 1, 4. On January 11, 2025, upon screening the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the Court found Plaintiff failed to state any federal claim, declined supplemental jurisdiction over his state law claims, and dismissed the complaint with leave to file an amended complaint by February 3, 2025. Dkt. No. 17. The Court warned that failing to file by that date “will be construed as consent to dismissal of the case without prejudice.” *Id.* at 6.

The deadline has passed, and Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint. Instead, on January 15, 2025, he filed a “notice of errata,” asking that his complaint be removed from the docket and that he be allowed to refile. Dkt. No. 20. This request was improper and unnecessary because the complaint already had been dismissed *with leave to amend*, rendering his request moot. Indeed, the court denied as moot Plaintiff’s prior request, on January 14, 2025, to file a corrected complaint and reminded him that he had been given leave to amend. Dkt. Nos. 18, 19.

To the extent the January 15 filing can be construed as a motion to reconsider the order dismissing the complaint, it raises no colorable ground for

reconsideration (e.g., “mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect”). Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). Plaintiff contends that “[s]ignificant errors” occurred during the electronic filing of his complaint and that those errors “distorted the nature of the case,” resulting in the dismissal. Dkt. No. 20 at 2. But the only error he identifies is that his complaint erroneously attached a request to proceed IFP. *Id.* at 2–3. That error is irrelevant to the grounds for dismissal. See Dkt. No. 17 (explaining the grounds for dismissal). Moreover, the January 15 filing did not excuse Plaintiff’s obligation to file an amended complaint as ordered by the Court.

Accordingly, as warned, this action is dismissed without prejudice.

Date: February 6, 2025

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'JBS', is written over a horizontal line.

Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr.  
United States District Judge